

Ellis, Cathy L. (WSA)

To: Sanders, Edward
Subject: FW: Comments on IARC

2060552272

Ted:

Please note below. To be frank - the same thought came to me when I read your message. Unfortunately, we didn't have enough time to discuss. It is very important that the SIM (or anyone else in WSA) group NOT communicate information to be used by CA etc. We can communicate directly to scientists - but a CA statement is more than a scientific statement. Thanks - we need to discuss this in Hong Kong.

—Original Message—

From: Keane, Denise
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 1998 4:14 PM
To: Ellis, Cathy L.
Subject: FW: Comments on IARC

2060552273

CATHY - GINNY WILL BE FORWARDING TO YOU, MARTY AND ELLEN - IARC BULLET POINTS WHICH INCORPORATE TED'S COMMENTS AND EVALUATION. THE BULLET POINTS ARE ALSO BEING SHARED WITH THE CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND LEGAL TEAMS WORLDWIDE.

I THINK THAT WE WOULD BE IN A BETTER POSITION TO ASSIST THE CLIENT IF COMMUNICATION POINTS CAME FROM ONE SOURCE.

PERHAPS YOU AND I SHOULD WORK OUT A SYSTEM TO INSURE THAT WE DON'T CONFUSE THE CLIENT. CLEARLY SCIENTIFIC EVALUATIONS SHOULD COME FROM WSA. THE SCIENTIFIC EVACUATIONS - EVEN THOUGH THEY FORM THE BASES OF OUR PUBLIC OPINIONS - ARE NOT NECESSARILY IDENTICAL WITH EXTERNAL MESSAGE POINTS WHICH ALSO INCORPORATE A REGULATORY MESSAGE. PERHAPS WE CAN DISCUSS FURTHER. THANKS

2060552274**REDACTED****REDACTED****REDACTED****REDACTED****REDACTED**